

FUTURISM and the Antichrist of Scripture

By Louis F. Were

A Solemn Warning and an Earnest Appeal to Prophetical Students

A WAVE of expectancy had swept over the land of Palestine. A deep impression had been made on the national mind of the Jews that the prophecies of the coming Messiah were soon to be fulfilled. Commencing with the devout who carefully studied the scrolls of the prophets, it spread to the ecclesiastical authorities who were constrained to do something in the matter, for the movement was rapidly gaining ground. They arose to direct the minds of the agitated people in a pleasing "orthodox" view. So the stirring of minds begun by the Holy Spirit leading men to a faithful acceptance of the coming Messiah, began to be side-tracked by that foe of God who is presented in Scripture as being indefatigable in unholy warfare; relentless and ceaseless in opposing fulfilling prophecy.

The learned rabbis taught that when the Messiah came, He would break the galling Roman yoke, and emancipating Israel, would elevate the liberated nation to the pinnacle of glory. This glowing outlook appealed to minds ready to receive pleasing interpretations. And so it came to

pass that when the true Messiah came "unto His own," "His own received Him not." John 1: 11. Why did they not receive Him? We stand amazed at the rejection of Christ by His own people. How accurately He fulfilled every detail of the Jewish prophets! How could they have been led to crucify the very One for whom all Jewry earnestly longed? They rejected Jesus because He did not fulfil the prophecies as interpreted by popular persuasion. See John 7: 27.

It is Satan's studied effort to blind the eyes to God's "present truth." God has promised that *every movement He inspires will have prophetic utterances to sustain it.* Amos 3: 7. He has seen where it would be necessary to meet the issues with special messages for the various times, and in the prophetic symbols He has hid the facts which would only be understood when the occasions demanded.

Satan, however, anticipating the fulfilment of these prophecies, devises false interpretations of them, referring their fulfilment to the future, and thus blinds eyes to the messages which God is sending at that particular time. Once people are persuaded

This brochure, written nearly 15 years ago, is included herewith because it unveils that false system of prophetic interpretation known as Futurism, of which the literal gathering of the nations to Megidde is a part.

ADVENTIST
HERITAGE CENTER
James White Library
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

that these things are future, and hence do not directly concern them, they are indifferent to the stirring messages due for their time.

As we study the lives of the disciples up to the time of the resurrection of Jesus, we see how they were blinded to the real import of Christ's messages by the prevailing errors.

It is, therefore, not surprising that today many noble Christians are also blinded by prevailing errors and misinterpretations of prophecies. As in those days, some saw the light and walked out into it, so we trust it may be in our day.

Incredible as it may seem, many Protestant preachers are now teaching that the God-inspired interpretations of prophecy, so forcefully presented by the early Reformers, and which were the bulwark of the great Protestant movement, are erroneous, and that hence the Reformers' untruthful exegesis of Scripture was the mainstay, the foundation, of the great God-sent Reformation!

To give a little of the history of the change of belief among Protestants and why it is of the greatest importance to this time, is the object of these articles.

THE TRUE PROTESTANT POSITION

THE Reformers were unanimous in their interpretation that the antichrist of the Books of Daniel and the Revelation is the Papacy. The particular passages involved in this connection are those dealing with the "little horn" of Daniel 7, "the beast" of Revelation 13, and "the man of sin" of 2 Thessalonians 2, which the united voices of the fearless Reformers declared to be the Papacy. When James I asked Lord Bacon as to the person described under the title of

"The Man of Sin," his answer represented the undivided testimony of the Reformation Protestants: "Please, your Majesty, if the prophecy in 2 Thessalonians 2 were inserted in a warrant, I should apprehend the pope."

The Rev. Edward Nangle, of Ireland, wrote in 1866: "The identity of the pope with the predicted 'man of sin' is perfect. . . . This prophecy, rightly interpreted is, as Bishop Newton well observes, like a two-edged sword inflicting a deadly wound on popery on one side, and on infidelity on the other."

The power of this weapon in the conflict with popery, was strongly felt by the Reformers and the Jesuits at the time of the Reformation. The former wielded it with terrible effect in their onslaught on the Papacy, and the Jesuits had no shield to avert the strokes but a counter interpretation. They [the Jesuits] contended . . . that it applied not to the pope, but to antichrist, who was to appear at the end of this dispensation. . . . The whole body of the Reformers, English and Continental, without a single exception, maintained that the pope was the 'man of sin.' All the Reformed churches held the same view, as did also the most eminent Protestant authors, with hardly an exception, up to the early part of the present century, when a Romanising High Church clergyman took up the Jesuit view. The evil leaven, thus introduced into the Protestant church, soon worked through the mass to such an extent, that we believe at the present time the majority of the evangelical clergy as well as the whole Tractarian party, have gone over in this matter, from the Reformers to the Jesuits. [Unfortun-

ately an increasing number of Protestants, ignorant of the origin of this belief, are being taught that this is Protestantism. This teaching is perhaps as popular now as were the erroneous ideas concerning the Messiah in the days when Jesus was rejected.] "That interpretation includes a slander on the Reformers, and the whole Protestant world, for three centuries."

"The Papists in Dr. Willett's day (as represented by their Jesuit champion, Cardinal Bellarmine) contended that antichrist has not been yet revealed; that he is to be an individual who will make his appearance at the close of this dispensation for three years and a half; and that the prophecy of the 'man of sin' in 2 Thessalonians 2 has reference to this future antichrist, and not to the Pope of Rome; and these assertions . . . were attempted to be proved by their Jesuit advocate with the same arguments which are now urged in their defence by the Protestant writers. . . . who have adopted the Jesuit view."—"The Man of Sin," pages 2, 64, 252. (Italics mine.)

And then this writer of the last century presents the arguments used by those who hold the "Futurist" interpretation, showing how they are identical with, if not borrowed from, the pen of such Catholic writers as Cardinal Bellarmine.

The belief that the Papacy fulfils the prophecies relating to the antichrist, which was "the unanimous opinion of the whole body of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, and the unanimous judgment of every Protestant church for nearly three hundred years," should be given first and most serious consideration before accepting a theory of a future antichrist which was invented by

Rome in its controversy with the Reformers.

Dr. H. G. Guinness has warned us to be "on our guard against any system of prophetic interpretation which emanates from Rome. . . . We should lean to Protestant and not to papal interpretations."—"Light for the Last Days," page 8.

WHY FUTURISM WAS INVENTED

THE Rev. Joseph Tanner, B.A., in his book "Daniel and the Revelation," pages 16, 17, says: "So great a hold did the conviction that the Papacy was the antichrist gain upon the minds of men, that Rome at last saw she must bestir herself, and try, by putting forth other systems of interpretations, to counteract the identification of the Papacy with antichrist."

"Accordingly, towards the close of the century of the Reformation, two of the most learned doctors set themselves to the task, each endeavouring by different means to accomplish the same end, namely, that of diverting men's minds from perceiving the fulfilment of the prophecies of the antichrist in the papal system. The Jesuit Alcasar devoted himself to bringing into prominence the preterist method of interpretation, . . . and thus endeavoured to show that the prophecies of antichrist were fulfilled before the popes ever ruled at Rome, and therefore could not apply to the Papacy. On the other hand, the Jesuit Ribera tried to set aside the application of these prophecies to the papal power by bringing out the futurist system, which asserts that these prophecies refer properly, not to the career of the Papacy but to that of some future supernatural individual, who is yet to appear, and to continue in power

for three and a half years. Thus, as Alford says, the Jesuit Ribera, about A.D. 1580, may be regarded as the founder of the futurist system in modern times.

"It is a matter for deep regret that those who hold and advocate the futurist system at the present day, Protestants as they are for the most part, are thus playing into the hands of Rome, and helping to screen the Papacy from detection as the antichrist. It has been well said that 'futurism tends to obliterate the brand put by the Holy Spirit upon popery.' More especially is this to be deplored at a time when the papal antichrist seems to be making an expiring effort to regain his former hold on men's minds."

Another has written: "The futurist theory is simply one of the wiles of Satan to confuse the issue and divert the attention of the church of Christ from the real fulfilment. . . . Some Protestants have . . . laid hold of the interpretation invented after the Reformation by the Jesuit Ribera for the purpose of turning the edge of this truth from the Church of Rome. They, like him, are looking for a future literal antichrist. . . . Like all Jesuit interpretations, it has a clever semblance of truth, which often deceives the hurried or superficial reader."—*Albert Close*.

Unanimity of Early Protestantism

DR. H. GRATTAN GUINNESS in his "Approaching End of the Age," pages 99-101, writing of the "historic Protestant view" of the prophecies which points out the Papacy as antichrist, says: "This view originated about the eleventh century, with those who even then be-

gan to protest against the growing corruptions of Rome. It grew among the Waldenses, Wycliffites, and Hussites, into a consistent scheme of interpretation, and was embraced with enthusiasm, and held, with intense conviction of its truth, by the Reformers of the sixteenth century. In their hands it became a powerful and formidable weapon, to attack and expose the mighty apostasy, with which they were called to do battle. From this time it spread with a rapidity that was astonishing, so that ere long it was received as a *self-evident and fundamental truth among Protestant churches everywhere*. [Italics mine.] It nerved the Reformers of England, France, Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, and Sweden, and the martyrs of Italy and Spain: it decided the conscientious and timid adherents of the Papacy to cross the Rubicon, and separate from the so-called Catholic Church; and it has kept all the Reformed churches since from attempted reunion with Rome.

"It was held and taught by Joachim Abbas, Walter Brute, Luther, Zwingle, Melancthon, Calvin, and all the rest of the Reformers; by Bullinger, Bale, and Foxe; by Brightman and Mede, Sir Isaac and Bishop Newton, Vitringa, Daubuz, and Whiston, as well as by Faber, Cunningham, Frere, Birks, and Elliott. . . . It met, of course, with the intense and bitter opposition from the church it branded as Babylon, and the power it denounced as antichrist and to this day it is rejected by all who in any way maintain or defend them."

I have selected three brief extracts from the commentaries of recognised conservative denominations to illustrate how all Protestant churches

once held this belief as a *fundamental of Protestantism*. Dr. Adam Clarke (Methodist), in his notes on Dan. 7: 25, "He shall speak great words against the Most High," says: "To none can this apply so well and so fully as to the pope of Rome." Dr. Albert Barnes (Presbyterian commentator), in his notes on Dan. 7: 25, says: "'Speaking great words against the Most High.' No Protestant will doubt that this is true of the Papacy, and no one acquainted with history will presume to call it in question." "'Making war with the saints.' Can anyone doubt that this is true of the Papacy?" Dr. Scott (Church of England), in notes on Daniel 7 and 8, says: "Whilst the prophet was considering these ten horns, he saw another little horn spring up among them. This evidently points out the Church and Bishop of Rome."

"The Rev. E. B. Elliott, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, spent twenty years studying in the preparation of his standard work, 'The Horæ Apocalypticae,' in which he proved papal Rome to be the antichrist of Scripture.

"Mr. Spurgeon, in his list of choice books for young ministers, recommends Elliott's work as 'the standard work on the Apocalypse.' The late Rev. Dr. Robert S. Candlish, Principal of New College, Edinburgh, who was a scholar of the first rank and had a wide acquaintance with theological literature, in a lecture on 'The Pope the Antichrist of Scripture,' spoke of Elliott as 'among the most learned, profound, and able expositors any of the books of Scripture have ever had.'

"These are the opinions of two of our greatest Christian leaders of the

value of Elliott's work, and his interpretation agrees in the main points with that of the great outstanding leaders ever since the Reformation." —*"The Hand of God and Satan in History," by A. Close, page 155.*

WILL PROTESTANTISM TURN BACK?

Now while it is refreshing to read the declarations of these leading churchmen, teaching definitely that "the pope is the antichrist of Scripture," it has been my painful lot to sit and listen to men, representing the same denominations as those spiritual giants, now teaching the popular, Jesuit-prepared theories of an antichrist who is yet future.

As I have read the commentaries of the leading Protestant churches in which such prophecies as the "little horn" of Daniel 7 are definitely *proved to be fulfilled in the history of the Papacy*, I can only marvel that so many adherents of these respective denominations, and of others, now prefer the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church to those of their godly denominational founders. It must be that many are unacquainted with the teachings of their spiritual progenitors, and do not know the origin of the doctrines of futurism. It is the desire to acquaint such with the facts that has prompted these lines.

Dr. H. Grattan Guinness in his "Romanism and the Reformation," pages 250-260, has irrefutably shown that futurism came from Rome to oppose the inspired declarations of the Reformers that the Papacy was the antichrist. Space will permit of but a few extracts from this masterly work. He writes of the Reformation: "From the first, and throughout, that movement was energised and guided

by the prophetic Word. Luther never felt strong and free to war against the papal apostasy till he recognised the pope as antichrist. It was then he burned the papal Bull. Knox's first sermon, the sermon which launched him on his mission as a Reformer, was on the prophecies concerning the Papacy. The Reformers embodied their interpretations of prophecy in their confessions of faith, and Calvin in his 'Institutes.'

"All the Reformers were *unanimous* in the matter. . . . And *their interpretation of these prophecies determined their reforming action.* . . . It nerved them to resist the claims of that apostate church to the uttermost. It made them martyrs, it sustained them at the stake. And the views of the Reformers were shared by thousands, by hundreds of thousands. They were adopted by princes and peoples. . . .

"To resist the use to which Scripture prophecy was put by the Reformers is no light or unimportant matter. The system of prophetic interpretation, known as *futurism*, *does resist this use.* It condemns the interpretations of the Reformers. It condemns the views of all these men, and of all the martyrs, and of all the confessors and faithful witnesses of Christ for long centuries. It condemns the Albigenses, the Waldenses, and the Wycliffites, and the Hussites, the Lollards, the Lutherans, the Calvinists; it condemns them all, and *upon a point on which they are all agreed*, an interpretation of Scripture which they embodied in their solemn confessions and sealed with their blood. It condemns the spring of their action, the foundation of the structure they erected. *How daring* is this act, and *how destitute* of justification! What an opposition to the

pillars of a work most manifestly divine! For it is no less than this, for futurism asserts that Luther and all the Reformers were wrong in this fundamental point.

"And *whose interpretation of prophecy does it justify and approve? That of the Romanists.* Let this be clearly seen. Rome felt the force of these prophecies, and sought to evade it. It had no way but to deny their applicability. It could not deny their existence in Scripture. They were there plainly enough. But it denied that these prophecies referred to the Roman Church and its head. It pushed them aside. It shifted them from the entire field of mediæval and modern history. As to Babylon the Great, it asserted that it meant Rome pagan, not Rome papal. Rome pagan shed all the blood referred to in Revelation 17 and 18. Rome Christian had shed none of it. Prophecy was eloquent about the deeds of the Cæsars, but silent as to those of the popes; and this though the persecution perpetrated by the popes far exceeded those of the Cæsars. Prophecy expended its strength in warning the church of the perils from heathenism, which it perfectly understood, and was speechless as to the far greater perils arising from the Christian apostasy on which it needed the fullest warning and instruction. It was eagle-eyed as to the dangers without, but blind to the dangers from within. It guarded and guided the church of the three first centuries, but *left the church of the next thousand years and more without a lamp to light its footsteps.*

"As to the prophecies of the man of sin, or antichrist, these [they teach] had nothing to do with the Middle Ages, or with the Roman

popes, or the long central centuries of the church's sorest conflicts; they only referred to a diminutive interval in the far-off future, at the end of the world. The man of sin was only an ephemeral persecutor. His whole power was to continue but three and a half years. He was to be a cunning Jew of the tribe of Dan; a clever infidel, who was to call himself God, and set himself up in a Jewish temple at Jerusalem. Christians have nothing to do with him as such. A Jew was to do all the mischief. The whole evil was but a Jewish infidel spasm in the very last hour of history before the second advent. Therefore the Reformers were all wrong in their denunciations of the Papacy. They were foolish, misguided, unreasonable, fanatical, and the popes were uncondemned by the voices of the prophets. Daniel and John said nothing about them. *They* were not the predicted apostates. . . . The prophecies which those contemptible Reformers and miserable so-called martyrs said applied to them did nothing of the sort; it was folly to suppose they did. They applied to other people and to other circumstances. They only applied to paganism and infidelity: a past and bygone paganism, and a future shortlived infidelity, and nothing more. *Three centuries in the past, and three years in the future*, that was all they had anything to do with. As to the *fifteen centuries* which lay between, they had no bearing upon them whatever. . . . The thunders of prophecy were *not directed against them, but against those dead Cæsars, and that unborn Jew.* . . .

"Which think you were right in their interpretations of Scripture? Those proud popes, those cruel inquisitors, those inhuman monsters

who mangled the bodies of holy men and women in their torture chambers, . . . or those pure and persecuted saints . . . those noble confessors, Reformers, and martyrs? With one mind and mouth all these Protestants agreed in the substances of their protests. To them Rome was Babylon, and its proud head antichrist. Were they all mistaken, deluded, and their cruel, tyrannical oppressors and persecutors correct? What think you? . . .

"Futurism has crept into the Protestant church, broken down these sacred walls. Romanists, ritualists, and Protestant futurists are *all agreed* as to the non-applicability of Scripture prophecies to the Church of Rome and the Papacy. . . . What then is to keep out the incoming papal flood? The Word of prophecy in its solemn warning of the dangers the church has to encounter, the foes it has to resist, is asserted to be silent as to this. Why then should this be feared? The Reformers were mistaken; the popes were right. . . . All these were right in rejecting the fundamental position that papal Rome is Babylon, and its head antichrist; and all the Reformers, without an exception, were wrong in maintaining it; they were foolish interpreters of the 'sure Word of prophecy,' and utterly in error as to the real testimony of Scripture concerning the Church of Rome.

"Is this the position you adopt? Is this the conclusion you defend? Are these the views you advocate? You, a Protestant, and this, *after all that has been written upon the subject*, and all the blaze of light which history and experience have poured upon it? If it is, *look to it that you be not found fighting against the*

truth, warring against the Word of God, resisting the testimony of the prophetic spirit, hindering the work of the Reformation, promoting the progress of the apostasy, opposing Christ, and helping antichrist."

Clouding the Real Issue

IT is remarkable that, out of three classes of interpretations of the pre-advent visions of the Apocalypse, two came from Roman Catholic Jesuits. The preterist scheme, which considers "these prophecies to have been fulfilled in the downfall of the Jewish nation and of the old Roman empire, limiting their range thus to the first six centuries of the Christian era, and making Nero antichrist, originated with the Jesuit Alcasar towards the end of the sixteenth century."—"The Approaching End of the Age," pages 97, 98.

From Rome this teaching spread to some hypnotised Protestants who did not see that it was a kind of smoke-screen to hide the real antichrist. But a God-aroused Protestantism urged all to interpret the prophecies as fulfilling before the eyes of all in the history of the Papacy. Rome stirred herself to oppose and to overthrow the mighty power of the Reformation. The preterist scheme was not sufficient to blind the eyes of the most cautious of an awakening people to the true antichrist; so another system of interpretation was devised more completely and more innocently to screen the antichrist. Therefore to meet the issue the futurist view was invented, teaching "that the prophetic visions of Revelation, from chapters 4 to 19, prefigure events still wholly future, and not to take place till just at the

close of this dispensation. . . . This view gives the literal Israel a large place in the Apocalypse, and expects a personal infidel antichrist, who shall bitterly oppress the saints for three years and a half, near the date of the second advent, thus interpreting time as well as much else in the Apocalypse, literally."—*Ib.*, page 100.

It is true that some of the primitive Fathers of the Catholic Church agree in several points with the futurist scheme, including a future personal antichrist; but, as is well known to Bible students who have made a thorough investigation of the use of prophecy, the fulfilment of a prophecy is only known in detail when it becomes history. Those living in the days when spiritual darkness was creeping over the earth could only speculate as to the meaning of the prophecies regarding the antichrist and of things then future. But when a prophecy is fulfilled or is fulfilling, then God awakens the minds of men to study that particular prophecy and to observe its fulfilment in current history.

When John the Baptist was asked why he preached as he did, he replied that he was fulfilling a certain prophecy. See Isa. 40: 3, also John 1: 23. When he was afterwards incarcerated in his gloomy prison cell, he sent messengers to inquire of Jesus, "Art Thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" That is, he had read the prophecies of the coming Messiah, and now he wanted to know if Jesus was fulfilling those prophecies.

"Jesus answered and said unto them, Go and show John again those things which ye do hear and see." Matt. 11: 2-4. Jesus' reply shows how much He based His work on the fulfilment of the prophecies regarding

Himself. The answer (in effect) came back: "I am fulfilling the prophecies outlined for the Messiah." But John, who had imbibed much of the erroneous theories of the "orthodoxy" of the time, had read into the prophecies what was not there regarding the coming One, as all do who prematurely detail futurity by prophecy. Christ told the messengers to return and show John "again," that the fulfilment of prophecy was His badge of authority, and He urged the friends of John to tell John what He was doing, and to ask John to see how these things actually did fulfil every specification of the Messiah's work.

All the movements of Scripture were started by an appeal to the pronouncements of the prophets. It is surprising, to those who have not previously studied the Scriptures closely, to observe how the preachers mentioned in the Bible drew the attention of their hearers to the fact that certain prophecies were meeting fulfilment in their day, and that God, who alone could foretell the future, was now speaking to them in these fulfilments. So, in harmony with this principle, the Reformers pointed to the unfolding history of the Papacy as the positively clear fulfilment of prophecy.

Dr. H. G. Guinness in his "Approaching End of the Age," pages 100, 101, writes of the futurist view: "In its present form, however, it may be said to have originated, at the end of the sixteenth century, with the Jesuit Ribera, who, moved like Alcasar, to relieve the Papacy from the terrible stigma cast upon it by the Protestant interpretation, tried to do so by referring these to the distant future, instead of like Alcasar to the distant past. For a considerable period

this view was confined to Romanists, [Italics mine], and was refuted by several masterly Protestant works. But of late years it has sprung up afresh, and sprung up (strange to say) among Protestants. It was revived by such writers as the two Maitlands, Burgh, Tyso, Dr. Todd, the leaders of the 'Brethren' generally, and by some Tractarian expositors also. It is held thus by extreme parties; by those who, though Protestants, are ashamed of the Reformation, speak of it as an unwarrantable schism, and verge as closely on Rome as is possible."

Are we warranted in believing that God, who has prophesied concerning many of the nations, at times going into details, has passed by the greatest power governing the largest number of people for the longest period of time? Is it possible that this power, with its stupendous claims for its leaders of taking God's place on earth, of possessing infallibility, of having power to forgive sins, with their centuries of world control during which they destroyed many millions of God's people, has had no cognisance taken of it in God's omniscient prophecies? Is it possible that the prophets, whose prophetic eyes have swept down the ages foretelling the details along the way, could possibly have omitted mentioning the most gigantic religious system of all, and then occupy so much space in the blessed Book foretelling things to occur in connection with a future Jewish remnant and the doings of an infidel antichrist who would reign for three and a half years after the church had gone to glory? Would God make no mention of the terrible dangers through which His people must pass and the terrible doings of the apostate church in its fury

against God's saints? Is it possible that the Bible has no word of comfort, no word of guidance, for the church of God during that long night of darkness, no room in the prophecies for the greatest tragedy in all the history of the church since Creation, because the space was occupied by prophecies regarding the doings of one infidel whose few moments of fury would be witnessed when the church was gone from this earth! Of what benefit is it to saints to know what is going to happen when the church is gone to heaven to be with her Lord? Is it possible that there are no prophecies to guide the church while it is bitterly contending with the forces of Satan, but only hazy pictures of the doings of an ephemeral antichrist which would not concern the church whatever! I stand amazed at the gullibility of these good folk.

Blunting the Edge of Practical Truth

IT is necessary now to point out the great danger facing the present-day prophetic student. To believe that many of the prophecies of Revelation are not to be fulfilled till after the church has gone to her reward, causes the believer thereof to lose interest in these prophecies as having no practical value for the present; and no matter how the staggering events of these times parallel those prophecies, they will be blind to it all. For does he not know that they refer to the future? Remember "that it is possible for the plainest and most satisfactory fulfilment of a prophecy to be forced on the attention, and yet be unperceived: witness the Jews in the days of Christ: witness the disciples by the

empty sepulchre."—*The Approaching End of the Age*, page 129.

Even so today prophecy of the greatest importance is being fulfilled before the eyes of this last generation; but many will be, and are being, blinded to it because they look into the future for the fulfilment.

Observe these pregnant statements of Dr. H. G. Guinness in the book from which we have quoted above: "As to every singular particular noted in the sure Word of prophecy, the plainest correspondence can be traced between the fourfold prediction and the papal fulfilment; and we cannot refrain from deprecating most earnestly the mischievous system of interpretation which teaches that this clear, undeniable, and grandly terrible accomplishment is *not the fulfilment intended*."

"Standing face to face with Jesus Christ, the disciples of John inquired in their master's name, 'Art thou He that should come, or look we for another?' They were answered by deeds, not words. The Lord wrought Messianic miracles in their presence, and said, 'Go and tell John what things ye have seen and heard'; that is, *He did the deeds which it had been predicted that the Messiah would do, and all were responsible to draw thence the inference that He was the Messiah*. So pointing to the church history of the last twelve centuries, we say, The Papacy has done the deeds which were to be done by the oft-predicted power of evil foretold in the Word of God! And we believe that *Christians are responsible to draw from the historical fact the inference, that the Papacy is the power that was thus predicted*."—*Pages 216, 217*.

"Hence our deep regret that futurist expositions should take off the

edge of this mightily practical truth; and that, as at the Reformation, they blinded the eyes of Papists to the true character of the Papacy—so they should *now blind Protestants to the real nature of the days in which we live*; depriving them of the certainty afforded by the sure Word of prophecy in this time of the end, and throwing them back on the uncertainty of earlier ages.

"A moment's reflection will show that in the past, while the beginnings of the ages and dispensations had general promises and predictions only, *chronological prophecy was always permitted to throw its solemnly helpful guiding light on the close*. The first prediction of this character ever given was that of the 120 years to elapse prior to the Flood, that great *close* of the antediluvian age. The second—the 400 years to the Exodus, marked the *close* of the entire patriarchal dispensation; the third—the 65 years to elapse before Ephraim's overthrow, led up to the *close* of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes; and the fourth—the 70 years' captivity of Judah, marked out by its commencement the *close* of Jewish monarchy, and by its termination, the *close* of the Babylonian empire; the fifth—the 490 years to Messiah the Prince, led up to the *close* of the Jewish dispensation.

"God graciously provided the help of chronologic prophecy to sustain to the end the faith and hope of His people. They who in this day despise that aid, or make it void by a fanciful, unhistoric, futurist interpretation, *cast aside an invaluable weapon for the special conflict of these closing days*."—*Ib.*, pages 354, 355.

The prophecies regarding the antichrist, which the Reformers so

unanimously preached, were not completely fulfilled in their day; they were to be completed in this generation when the work of the Reformation would be completed and the work of antichrist fully revealed. These same prophecies foretold of a great message to go to all the world with a definite call revealing the whole of God's truth, which the Reformers were only beginning to see. This message, based upon the prophecies uncompleted in the days of the Reformers, is now being given to all the world. In Rev. 14: 6-14 is a prophecy of a threefold message which is clearly set forth as being given to all the world just prior to the second advent. See verse 14.

The coming of Jesus is near at hand, as is acknowledged by many, but where is that threefold message which must of necessity be today going to the world to fulfil this prophecy? Why is it that the staggering fulfilment is not more widely recognised? Because Satan, a master student of the prophetic Word, knowing that before the second advent these prophecies would meet their completion and that the people pictured in prophecy would arise as messengers in the past had arisen, with an appeal to the prophecies which foretold their work, caused to be invented a system of interpretation of prophecy which would not only hide his agents in the days of the beginning of the Reformation, but would screen them for all time and would blind the eyes of many of the present generation so that they would not see or not believe the complete fulfilment of the prophecies in the message God is now sending to all the world.

How wonderfully his design has worked! Here are the facts that a people, proving their position by the

prophecies, are calling the attention of all to the work of the "little horn" of Daniel 7, where its attack on the unchangeable law of God is outlined. All the Reformers and all the Protestant churches for three hundred years believed and taught that this "little horn" symbolised the Papacy. They did not know just where such a belief would eventually take their spiritual descendants, God very definitely stating that not until "the time of the end" (Dan. 12: 4) would the full significance of these things be seen and taught. Then all the Protestant churches were likewise unanimous in their teachings concerning the perpetuity of God's law, while Roman Catholicism believed it could alter God's law, and has attempted to put its belief into practice. Dan. 7: 25. Protestantism differed from Roman Catholicism in two fundamental principles; namely, the Papacy was the antichrist, and God's law was immutable. Roman Catholicism taught that antichrist was future, and that God's law could be changed to suit circumstances.

Futurism and Law Abolition

THOSE who have followed Rome in the theory of futurism have likewise followed her in teaching that God's law could be changed, and had actually been changed, holding that the observance of Sunday instead of the seventh-day Sabbath demonstrated such a change. At one time all the Protestant churches emphasised the binding nature of God's law, but coincident with their acceptance of papal futurism they have now swung around to the papal opposition to God's law. And let it be observed that the very ones mentioned by Dr. Guinness as

the chief instruments for the introduction of futurism into Protestantism are also the fiercest opponents of the truth of the immutability of the law of Jehovah. They are the ones who have largely led Protestants to abandon their firm belief in the unchangeable nature of God's law. It appears therefore to be plain to the onlooker, anxious only for truth, that *futurism has in some way an association with a spirit of opposition to the unchanging nature of God's law, for the two things always go together.*

While Protestants held to the truth that the Papacy is the antichrist of Scripture, they also held to the perpetuity of the law of God, as may be seen by reading their articles of faith. But now that they are swinging over to papal futurism, they are likewise emphasising more and more the papal doctrine that God's law could be changed, and boasting of a freedom from that law, which agrees with papal assumptions of having had power to change it. Therefore it is self-evident even now that theologically "all the world wonders after the beast," as the prophecy declared it would do before the second advent. Rev. 13: 3. All nations are even now being made drunk with the wine of Rome's doctrines. Rev. 17: 2; 18: 3. This solemn fact, it is likewise prophesied, would be proclaimed to the world before Jesus comes. See Rev. 14: 8, 14.

Now here is a remarkable fact: It is predicted that all those who will not keep God's commandments will fall into harmony with Rome in the main fundamentals. See Rev. 13: 8 and compare with Rev. 21: 27; 22: 14. All those whose names are in the book of life and who oppose Rome's doctrines believe God's law is un-

changeable and of supreme authority. As Satan was the author of disregard for God's law, and also the author of futurism, we can read his designs for these last days in the great struggle between the forces of good and evil. *He devised futurism as a system of prophecy which would blind the people's eyes to the last great message now going to all the world, and which is fulfilling the prophecies.* Scripture is very plain in its pronouncements to the effect that the controversy would close with a great conflict over the law of God.

"And the dragon [Satan, verse 9] was wroth with the woman [the church, 2 Cor. 11: 2, etc.], and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." Rev. 12: 17. The "remnant," or *last of the church*, is to hold to the perpetuity of the law, and will be against futurism. How do futurists answer this plain prediction? They answer it by relegating it to the future, *while they assist in the very fulfilment of it*, preaching that the law was abolished or changed, and manifesting a wrathful spirit against the upholders of the law's immutability. This can be seen in the tracts written against them, and I can abundantly testify concerning it from my experiences in evangelistic work. It is a notable fact that many futurists write tracts opposing, and vigorously preach against, the people who are giving the message predicted in prophecy to precede the coming of Jesus; but they say no word against the Papacy with its dark history. The reason is very apparent to the thoughtful.

The Christian faith is built upon the fulfilment of the prophecies of the Old Testament. The apostles

were chosen to show the people that Jesus *had* accomplished the prophetic requirements. They declared, in effect: "Do not look into the future for the completion of these prophecies, Jesus *has* fulfilled them in every detail." In these words of Scripture they frequently said: "We are His witnesses of these things." Acts 1: 8; 2: 32; 3: 15; 5: 32; 10: 39.

Hear the earnest preaching of Peter as recorded in Acts 3: 15-24: "We are witnesses. . . . But those things, which God before had showed by the mouth of *all* His prophets, that Christ should suffer, *He hath so fulfilled.* . . . Yea, and *all* the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of *these days.*"

JUDAISM MADE A SIMILAR MISTAKE

How remarkably do our days parallel those of our blessed Saviour's earthly pilgrimage. The Jews, in rejecting the message which Christ brought to them based upon the prophecies, placed the fulfilment of those prophecies far in the future; and yet, as Paul so clearly stated in his sermon, "because they knew Him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets [they thought they knew them], which are read every Sabbath day, *they have fulfilled them in condemning Him.*" Acts 13: 27. Continuing, the inspired apostle said: "*And when they had fulfilled all that was written of Him, they took Him down from the tree, and laid Him in a sepulchre. But God raised Him from the dead: and He was seen many days of them which came up with Him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are His witnesses unto the people. And we declare unto you the glad*

tidings, how that the promise [prophecy] which was made unto the fathers, *God hath fulfilled* the same unto us their children, in that He hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written." Verses 29-33.

Then he quotes Old Testament predictions (verses 33-37), saying in effect: "Jesus *hath* fulfilled these prophecies"; and those who today are looking into the future for their fulfilment, are prevented by Satan from seeing that they "*are* accomplished." Paul urged his hearers to see how marvellously Jesus *had* fulfilled the Messianic predictions.

"They *had* fulfilled all that was written of Him," even by their rejection of Him; yet they did not see that *they had fulfilled, and were fulfilling, the very prophecies which they relegated to the unknown future.* No wonder Paul uttered this warning which is applicable today: "Beware therefore, lest that come upon you, which is spoken of in the prophets; Behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish: for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you." Acts 13: 40, 41.

Today futurists, like the unbelieving Jews, are still looking to the future for the fulfilment of prophecies which have been, and are being, fulfilled in every detail.

Fanciful and Unwarranted Interpretations

FUTURISM, which is sweeping the world, contrary to the foundation of the Reformation, is knowingly, in face of light from heaven, carrying with it a changed law. The continuance of the Reformation depends upon adherence to

the fundamentals of Protestantism, and builds on the work of the Reformers. Present-day Protestantism must see and teach what had not, in the beginning of the Reformation, impressed itself on the minds of these good men. *The time was not then ripe* for making known to the world that the papal antichrist had, during the long years of its supremacy, changed its day of worship from Sabbath to Sunday.

Quite a number of the prophecies connected with the work of antichrist speak of a world-wide message unveiling the facts of antichrist's work against God's law, as seen in the attempted change of the Sabbath. Now the issue for the world today is: If these prophecies picturing the complete revelation of antichrist's work are future, then Rome was right at the time of the Reformation, and the founders of the Protestant churches were wrong. If, on the other hand, Rome was wrong and the Reformers right, then from the same prophecies, which were the foundation of the Reformation, must be preached a return to the Sabbath of God which was changed by the antichrist. In harmony with the prophecies, such a world-wide message is today being proclaimed in more than 400 different languages, and entering a new language at the rate of about one each week. Such a phenomenal movement in religion has not been seen before on this planet.

Some, clearly seeing the issue, prefer Roman Catholic futurism, which hides the Sabbath message from the eyes of the present, and postpones the fulfilment of these prophecies to the future under the reign of an imaginary antichrist. *Others are ignorant of the issue, and for their sake*

the facts are presented. If the Papacy is not the antichrist, as all the Reformers and all Protestant churches for three centuries declared, then Protestants owe Catholics many apologies; but no mistake was made in so designating the Papacy.

If the reader has previously believed in the futuristic view, I make this appeal to him to give earnest serious study to the historical Protestant view. Do not accept futurism because it is now popular; remember how popular, and yet misleading, were the interpretations of the Messianic prophecies of the Jews, which *led that people to fulfil those very prophecies in their rejection of Him, while they looked into the future for the Messiah to come.* Jesus earnestly preached to that people, blinded by satanic, and hence popular, systems of interpretation: "The time is fulfilled." Mark 1: 15. "*This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears.*" Luke 4: 21. And He proved it by a masterly knowledge of the prophetic passages which set forth His glorious work, and gave overwhelming evidences by wonderful miracles. And yet how few there were among so many students of prophecy who believed in Him! They did not see the fulfilment of the prophecies in Him and His work, because they felt that their fulfilment was still future!

History will repeat itself (Eccl. 1: 9), but let it not occur with you, dear reader. Look and see! Wonderful prophecies are being fulfilled today before your very eyes.

May God guard you from the seductive system of interpretation which is blinding the eyes of many to God's great message now going to all the earth in harmony with the inspired prophecies.

FACTS FACING FUTURISM

EARLY believers, taught by the disciples, believed that pagan Rome was the hinderer which prevented the rise of antichrist. 2 Thess. 2: 7. Pagan Rome, being "taken out of the way," enabled "that wicked" (verse 7) to be "revealed." See verse 8.

Christ, Paul prophesied, would not come until antichrist should be revealed. Verses 1-3. The Papacy has been revealed. The plan was not that Christ should first come and then antichrist would be revealed, as futurism teaches.

The "man of sin" was to be revealed, not by the departure of the church from the earth, but through a "falling away" from apostolic teachings, which is true of the history of the Papacy.

Of the hinderer it reads, "until *he* be taken out of the way." The church is never in all Scripture spoken of as "*he*"—always feminine. It is incongruous to say of the Holy Spirit, "*He* be taken out of the way."

The temple in which antichrist would sit in authority is God's spiritual temple—His church. Verse 4; 1 Tim. 3: 15; 1 Cor. 3: 17; Eph. 2: 22.

The "mystery of iniquity" was "already" working in Paul's day, and soon afterwards developed into the Papacy. Verse 7; Acts 20: 28-30.

The expression "son of perdition" (verse 3) is only used in one other place in the New Testament, and is there applied to Judas, who was *not a blasphemous infidel* but a *professed follower of Jesus*, even when betraying Him. Even so antichrist "the son of perdition" will not be a blasphemous infidel as futurism teaches, but an apostate church professing to serve Christ while working contrary to Him.

Antichrist's "blasphemy" (Rev. 13: 6) is manifested in a false system of worship. Isa. 65: 17; Eze. 20: 27, 28; Rom. 2: 24, etc.

Antichrist's denial is seen in its works, more than in its words. 1 John 2: 22; Titus 1: 16.

The "lawless" one is one who behaves contrary to God's law, which the Papacy has done, ordering the destruction of those whom it considers heretics, and attempting to change God's law. See Dan. 7: 25. God regards the law thus changed as belonging to the lawless antichrist. See Ps. 94: 20, 21.

FUTURISM HAS AN INTERPRETATION OF ITS OWN WHICH IS FOREIGN TO THE WHOLE PLAN OF SCRIPTURE

To fit in with futurism, the "beast" of Revelation 13 is forced to represent an individual antichrist, when a cruel or wild "beast" is never employed to represent an individual in all the symbols of Scripture prophecies. See Dan. 7: 1-8, 23; 8: 1-11, 20, 21, etc. Beasts in prophecy represent powers governing for many years with a succession of rulers.

Because of the use of the definite article "*the*" in the expressions, "the man of sin," and "the antichrist," it is said that antichrist can only be one man. But as the Rev. E. Nangle has shown in "The Man of Sin," page 158:—

"We shall now show that the supposition that the words 'man of sin' designate an official succession, or class, is *not* an unwarranted assumption.

"Thus in Num. 35: 25-28, the succession of high priests is spoken of as *the* high priest.

"In 1 Sam. 8: 11, the succession of

kings in Israel is spoken of as *the* king.

"In Rom. 1: 17, all justified persons are spoken of as *the* just man.

"In 2 Tim. 3: 17, the whole succession and body of Christian ministers are designated *the* man of God."

"In Heb. 9: 7 and 24, the succession of high priests is spoken of as *the* high priest."

"In 2 John 5: 7, the '*many* deceivers,' who, as the apostle says, are entered into the world, are described as *the* antichrist."

"In Rev. 12: 1-6, the church of Christ during the period of 'a thousand two hundred and threescore days' is described as *the* woman."

"Likewise in Rev. 17: 4, the Church of Rome, as she persecuted the Lord's people for many ages, is described as *the* woman drunken with the blood of saints," etc.

Mr. Nangle goes on to show how even the hinderer was also a succession of men—the emperors of the pagan Roman empire.

In all the New Testament "saint" means Christian, but futurism indicates that "saint" in the Apocalypse means a Jew. Why is the difference here?

In all the New Testament the church is referred to as the bride of Christ, and the pronoun "she" should always be used; but a special licence must be issued for the sake of futurism in 2 Thess. 2: 7, where the hinderer to antichrist (claimed by futurists to be the church) is spoken of as "he." Some futurists, too, make the "man-child" of Rev. 12: 5 (obviously Jesus) represent the church taken up at the second advent, which is contrary to the figures used elsewhere in the New Testament.

God's temple on earth in this dispensation, as is definitely taught in all the New Testament, is His church (1 Tim. 3: 15, etc.); but in the passages in which *futurism* is affected, there alone it is mistakenly held to mean a literal building. 2 Thess. 2: 4.

The "son of perdition," applied elsewhere to a professed follower of Christ must, when interpreted by futuristic theories, refer to an infidel antichrist, giving it a different meaning from the one definitely given in Scripture.

To "blaspheme," which is used in Scripture concerning a false system of worship (Isa. 65: 17, etc.), means infidel utterances according to futurism. To "deny" is likewise misused by futurism to mean a direct infidel denial by antichrist, whereas Scripture teaches that we may profess to serve God, but "in works deny Him." See Titus 1: 16; Matt. 10: 32; Luke 9: 23, etc.

All Scripture is given to the church to be profitable now (2 Tim. 3: 16, 17); but futurism makes the last communication of Christ to His church (Revelation) of no practical value, instead of *most important* as one would expect it to be.

Jesus urges the church to keep the sayings recorded in this Book of Revelation (Rev. 1: 1, 3; 22: 6); but futurism teaches that it is impossible to keep the major portion of them, for they are future and do not affect the church, as the church will have been taken away before the events prophesied take place.

Futurism makes the "hereafter" of Rev. 4: 1 mean that what is written after that verse applies after the church has been taken away, whereas any other person would read it as *from John's day*, as will be seen by

comparing Rev. 1: 19 and 4: 1 with Rev. 22: 10.

It is said the first three chapters of Revelation bring us to the church's removal, and then "hereafter" means from then; but that reasoning would destroy the force of the admonition to the church to keep the prophecies of this book (Rev. 22: 7, 9) "*for the time is at hand.*" Verse 10. Turning to Revelation 20, 21, and 22 we find described the destruction of the wicked and the rejuvenation of the world, wherein are the saved of a completed redemption. Now it is evident that what follows the first few chapters of Revelation is not to be understood as taking place after the wicked are destroyed and the new earth established, for verse 11 speaks of the close of probation; verse 12 speaks of the second advent; verse 16 directs that the Book of Revelation be read in all the churches; verse 17 represents Christ as still pleading for sinners *after they would have been all destroyed*, if futurism is true; and in verses 19, 20 people are threatened with the seven last plagues which fall *before* Christ comes.

Futurism Introduces Unheard-of Rules

AS all know who are free from bias, the prophets retrace their steps often in their predictions, following one theme to completion, then going over the same ground with additional features. So by the "hereafter" of Rev. 4: 1, the angel comes back to John's day and describes another series of events reaching to the coming of Christ. This is how our godly Protestant translators understood it, as will be seen in the synopsis at the heading

of the sixth chapter of Revelation: "The opening of the seals in order, and what followed thereupon, containing a prophecy to the end of the world." "Nearly all the writers of the first fifteen centuries of the Christian era entertained the view that the Apocalypse was a comprehensive prophecy, *reaching from the date of its publication to the end of all things.*"—"The Approaching End of the Age," page 130.

Futurism would alter this established belief.

All the New Testament terms regarding the old Jewish services are given a Christian spiritual meaning. See Heb. 13: 15, 16; Col. 2: 11-13; Rom. 2: 27, 28; John 6: 31-35, etc. But futurism makes the Jewish imagery different. Why?—To make it fit in with the theory.

The prophecies of Scripture start in the time of the prophet who delivered them and unfold without any gaps till the consummation. See Daniel 2, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, etc. But futurism makes things different in those parts which affect it, and places about 2,000 years between the parts of the prophecies, and that without the slightest indication from those prophecies that this was intended by the divine Author of the prophecy.

An astounding exegesis of Dan. 9: 24-27 by futurists, in which the seventieth week is wrenched from the seventy weeks for the Jews, and about 2,000 years placed in between the sixty-ninth and the seventieth week, without any hint from, and even contrary to, the Scripture concerned, illustrates the extent to which people will go in maintaining a pet and popular theory. The Scripture makes it as plain as language can make it that *all* that was prophesied

to take place in connection with this period was to occur between the beginning and the ending of those seventy weeks. I refer the reader to Philip Mauro's "The Seventy Weeks and the Great Tribulation," wherein this writer (unfortunately himself a believer in the future antichrist) shows the utter nonsense of separating any part of the seventy weeks.

In this book Philip Mauro says: "Who is 'the prince that shall come?' . . . it would seem quite clear that 'the prince,' whose people were to destroy the city and the sanctuary, was Titus, the son of the then Emperor Vespasian, he (Titus) being the 'prince'; . . . in fact we are bold to say that the words of the prophecy, which are the words of God sent directly from heaven to Daniel, do not reasonably admit of any other interpretation. Nor, so far as we are aware, was any other meaning ever put upon them *until within recent years*, and then only by those belonging to a particular 'school' of interpretation. [Zealous futurists.] This is a very radical idea, one which changes the entire meaning of this basic prophecy, and *affects the interpretation of all prophecy.* It transfers the main incidents of the prophecy of the seventy weeks from Christ to antichrist, and removes them bodily from the distant past to the uncertain future, thus separating them far from all connection with the period of seventy weeks to which God assigns them. This manner of dealing with Scripture is, so far as our experience goes, *without parallel or precedent in the field of exegesis.* Is it sound and sober interpretation, or is it *playing pranks with prophecy?*"

Yes, futurism does have an interpretation of its own, and one entirely foreign to the Scripture.

Placing the events of the seventieth week in their right place, with the cross of Jesus the focus of the prophecy, Mr. Mauro says:—

"On the other hand, to make this last week refer to a paltry bargain between antichrist (or a supposed Roman prince) and some apostate Jews of the future, for the renewal (and that for a space of only seven years) of those sacrifices which *God has long ago abolished for ever*, is to intrude into this great scripture a matter of trifling importance, *utterly foreign to the subject in hand*, and to bring the entire prophecy to an absurdly lame and impotent conclusion."—Page 88.

"We come now to the view, held and taught by many modern expositors of good repute, that the week which came next after the sixty-ninth week from the starting-point, and which was in fact *the seventieth actual week* as time is ordinarily reckoned, is not to be taken as the seventieth week of the prophecy; but that the prophetic period is to be regarded as having been interrupted at the end of the sixty-ninth week, 'the clock of prophecy having stopped.' They hold that some period of seven years yet in the future is to be taken (when it comes) and added to the sixty-nine weeks now in the past to make up the complete number of seventy. Or, as it is sometimes expressed, this entire age of over 1,900 years comes in as a 'parenthesis' between the sixty-ninth and the seventieth week of the prophetic period. We deem this view to be erroneous, and believe we can show clearly that it is not supported by, but is *contrary to, the testimony of Scripture.* We maintain that the seventieth week of the prophecy occurred just where we would expect to find the seventieth number of any

series, and that is next after the sixty-ninth; or, in other words, that the seventieth *actual* or *historical* week was also the prophetic week.

"*Never since the world began* has a 'described and 'determined' measure of time, expressed in the way always used for that purpose (that is, by stating the number of time-units making up the complete measure), been treated according to the view we are now discussing. *Never* has a specified number of time-units, making up a described stretch of time, been taken to mean anything but *continuous* or *consecutive.*"—*Ib.*, pages 93, 94.

And so futurism finds it necessary to introduce unheard-of things—special rules of interpretations to establish its claims.

Though futurism says otherwise, the church is seen on earth during all the time between Revelation 4 and Revelation 19. It is true that those who were resurrected at the time of Christ's glorious resurrection and who ascended with Him, are seen in the heavenly courts. Compare Matt. 27: 50-53; Eph. 4: 8, margin; Rev. 4: 4, 10; 5: 8. The number of the elders (twenty-four) refers us back to the time when the high priest in the Jewish sanctuary—a type of the greater temple in heaven (Heb. 8: 1-5)—had twenty-four assistants with him at a time. See 1 Chron. 24: 4-18; 25: 31; Eze. 8: 16. The ones seen in the heavenly courts were a special number raised to assist Jesus, man's High Priest, in the temple above; they are *not the entire church.* The church is still seen on earth between Revelation 4 and 19, praying, and wrestling with the evil one. Compare Rev. 6: 9 with chapter 1: 9.

The church is to be seen preaching the gospel, and keeping the com-

mandments of God right down to the coming of Christ. Rev. 14: 6-14. That the threefold message of Rev. 14: 6-14 is to go to all the world *now* before the coming of Christ, is evident from verse 14, and also because those who heed this message are coupled with those who have come up in the first resurrection at the coming of Christ and reign with Christ during the 1,000 years which begin at the coming of Christ. Rev. 20: 4, 5; 1 Thess. 4: 16-18. Therefore futurism is again wrong in saying that these messages are to be given after the church is taken away at the first resurrection and the second advent.

This list of objections to futurism could be greatly extended. A system of interpretation which is so contrary to the general Bible principles of explaining itself, which has a separate set of rules to accommodate itself, and which opposes the foundation of

the great God-sent Reformation, did not originate in heaven, but in the mind of the great adversary of souls, the enemy of God and man.

Dear reader, hitherto you may have believed in futurism, thinking it to be undefiled Protestantism. I would ask you, therefore, to take these lines as an appeal to come back to the belief of our godly, spiritual forefathers. I have been attacking an "ism," not those who hold it. I contend with futurism, but not futurists. Many of God's gems have been ensnared in it, but the time has come for eyes blinded by futurism to be opened to the fact that God's great message is now going to the world.

May this little pamphlet be blessed by Him "who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son." Amen.